

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/780,618	02/12/2001	Martin Sommer	SGW-109 9111		
23599 7590 02/15/2007 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			EXAMINER		
			CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, media (or or o	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1772			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. Applicant(s)	
09/780,618 SOMMER ET AL.	
Examiner Art Unit	
Alicia Chevalier 1772	

	Alicia Officialici	1 '''2	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 January 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or to the check either box (b) or to the check either box (c) or to the checked, check either box (d) or to the checked, ch	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr pinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NC		ecause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			•
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see continuation sheet. 		n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 11. because: It remains the Examiner's position that the claims are unpatentable for reasons previously of record in the final office action.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments in the after final response filed January 25, 2007 regarding the 35 USC 102 rejection of record have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant argues that the examiner ignores part of the claims. Applicant specifically points out, claim 1 (assuming 30) and claim 57, recites the flowing "a sealing element which is a brittle fracture material which consists of glass, glass ceramic or ceramic."

It is noted that Applicant does not claim that the "sealing element consists of a brittle fracture material." The sealing element *is* a brittle fracture material, in which the brittle fracture material "consists of" glass, glass ceramic or ceramic. Therefore, Pace's feed-throughs, which comprises a refractive metal co-fired with a green ceramic (col. 7, lines 10-14), anticipates the sealing element because at least one of the brittle fracture materials consists of ceramic.

Applicant also argues that claim 51 recites "the sealing material consists of a brittle-fracture material."

Claim 51 does not recite that the brittle fracture material "consists of" glass, glass ceramic or ceramic. It is noted that claim 51 does not have any dependent claims. Therefore, Pace's feed-throughs, which comprises a refractive metal co-fired with a green ceramic (col. 7, lines 10-14), is considered to be a brittle fracture material.

Art Unit: 1772

Applicant further argues that the composition of the sealing element is explicitly restricted by the language "consists of." The examiner disagrees with Applicant's statement since Applicant does not claim that the "sealing element consists of a brittle fracture material."

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ac †

ALICIA CHEVALIER